

Ken Hodges

BACKGROUND ON THE CENSUS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The 2010 Census Advisory Committee (CAC) provides advisory input to the Census Bureau on the design of the 2010 census, the American Community Survey, and related programs. Committee members represent a range of census stakeholders, and APDU's seat on the Committee provides a channel for APDU members to comment from the data user perspective.

Ken Hodges is your APDU representative on the 2010 Census Advisory Committee, and Bill O'Hare is your alternate representative. This report summarizes the April 8-9, 2010 CAC meeting. Contact Ken ken.hodges@nielsen.com or Bill wohare@aecf.org with comments, questions, or suggestions.

APRIL 8-9 MEETING OF THE 2010 CENSUS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Day One

Call to Order and Opening Remarks

Nancy Gordon, the Census Bureau's Designated Federal Official started the meeting with introductory remarks, and noted that the next meeting of the CAC is scheduled for October 21-22, 2010.

CAC Chair Marc Morial made opening remarks, and complimented Census Bureau Director Bob Groves on his response to media inquiries during this critical phase of the 2010 census. CAC Vice Chair Pauline Medrano added her introductory remarks.

Director's Remarks

Bob Groves. Director, Census Bureau

Census Director Bob Groves acknowledged that everyone wants to know how well the census is going, so he described the daily tracking of mailback response, but also the survey that asks if respondents had heard about the census, and if they intend to respond. The results show a sharp increase (from December through March) in the percent of people who have heard something about the census in the past week. Census messages seem to be getting out as intended, as the percent hearing about the census is similar across race categories. Persons age 18-24 report a notably low intent to participate in the census, but this is thought to reflect many living with parents who are the likely respondents. And recent communications targeted to this group seem to have narrowed the response intention gap.

Groves observed that the pattern of high and low mail returns is almost exactly as expected based on previous censuses. He also explained that the "participation rate" used for 2010 differs from the "response rate" from 2000 in that the denominator does not

include forms returned as undeliverable. Many of these are vacant units, which have likely become more numerous given the current economy.

A graph tracking daily participation percentages versus pre-census projections shows actual rates running very close to the upper bound projections. The upper projections lead to a final mail participation rate a bit higher than 70 percent, while the low projections suggest a bit lower than 70 percent. When Chair Marc Morial asked how mail participation compares with 2000, Groves said it is a difficult comparison, but expressed the view that it may be a little behind the 2000 rate. But he stressed that the mailback phase had not finished, and that they were hoping for a late bump in response to the mailing of replacement forms (something not done in 2000). Groves confirmed that they are taking additional steps, such as targeting messages and other efforts at areas where participation is lagging.

Groves also described a common misperception that funds distribution is based on mailback participation rates, when in fact it is based on final counts following non-response follow up (NRFU).

Corporate Priority Setting Process

Thomas Mesenbourg. Deputy Director, Census Bureau

Messenbourg described a new corporate priority setting process that is designed to surface programmatic challenges, identify priorities in response to challenges, and fund proposals that offer the greatest opportunity to reduce costs and increase operational efficiency. The process is important because with tight federal budgets, the Bureau can only sustain its programs, and generate capital investment funds by eliminating duplicative or unnecessary activities, streamlining processes, and implementing more cost-effective methods. Strategies for achieving these goals include improved internal and external collaboration, adopting responsive, adaptable and resilient methods and processes, standardizing and simplifying work processes, and data-driven decision making.

The process is at a conceptual stage, but the Bureau has talked with other statistical agencies about their experiences with similar efforts, issued a call to identify major challenges anticipated in the next 3 to 5 years, and conducted senior management meetings to categorize challenges and clarify strategic themes. The next steps are to promote communication, refine the process for evaluating proposals, put out a call for cost efficiency proposals, and determine which proposals will be funded.

Terry Ao (Asian American Justice Center) expressed concern that an over-emphasis on the most cost-effective methods could undermine efforts to get a complete count of hard-to-count populations. Messenbourg assured that the focus is on internal operations, and not the methods impacting the accuracy or completeness of census counts. Ken Hodges (Association of Public Data Users) wondered how confident we could be that savings through efficiency would be available for investment, or if appropriators would just

squeeze the budget further. Messenbourg said no one knows about future budgets, but stressed the importance of achieving the efficiencies.

2010 Census Communications Update

Steven Jost. Associate Director for Communications, Census Bureau

Jost said the census advertising campaign has become high profile, but that messaging is needed to offset some of the controversy it has generated. He cited as especially effective, the message that the government saves about \$85 million for each percentage point increase in mailback response, and the message that the cost is just 42 cents per mailback response versus an average of 57 dollars for non-response follow up.

Tracking data indicate that by April 5, about 90 percent of the population had heard at least something about the census, and the percent indicating an intent to participate had increased from 75 to about 90 percent. Jost credited the mail response maps with generating keeping-up-with-the-Joneses-dynamic as communities see how they are doing relative to others, and are motivated to promote response.

Jost also noted that they have allocated an extra \$2.5 million for messages in selected markets targeting both displaced persons and households that may be hosting them. He also described a set of “rapid response options” for messaging as issues arise. These could range from the distribution of press releases and radio DJ scripts to visits from Census and Commerce officials to engage with local government leaders. Examples of response interventions include additional funds for a confidentiality campaign in Phoenix, messages targeting young adults, urban families radio, and English-Dominant Hispanic TV. Jost reported that an additional \$22.7 million has been deployed for other intervention initiatives, and he expressed confidence that these and other efforts will contribute to a mail response that is as good or better than that of 2000.

CAC Chair Marc Morial expressed enthusiasm for the planned blitz activities, but said communications with his Urban League network suggest that many local organizations have not been engaged. He also recommended that steps be taken to promote awareness of and cooperation with the non-response follow up (NRFU) operation. Arturo Vargas (National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials) and Ilene Jacobs (California Rural Legal Assistance) spoke of the need for consistency in messages on the suspension of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raids on unauthorized immigrant populations – with Census headquarters sometimes saying one thing and local census officials saying something else.

With the top listing from a YouTube search on “census” being the Jerry Day anti-census video (with over 1.7 million viewings), Ken Hodges (APDU) asked if NRFU enumerators will receive training on how to respond to the specific assertions and questions that non-respondents are being coached to cite as justification for non-cooperation. Marilia Matos (Associate Director for Field Operations) said enumerators are trained to handle resistant non-respondents, but that training is not specific to these anti-census questions and assertions. Jost explained that the Census Bureau has

responded to the video, in which Day asserts that the Census Bureau has “no answer” for a list of questions that supposedly expose the lack of census authority. As Jost described it, the Census Bureau posted answers on Day’s website, but he immediately took them down. YouTube is not willing to remove the Day video, but the Census Bureau is able to direct viewers to an explanation of the constitutional authority of the census. Jost also noted that research shows that those receptive to the Day video tend to be responsive to the idea of constitutional authority. If you can convince them of the authority, they might not like the census, but they will respond to it.

The discussion ranged beyond the communications campaign, with several reps asking about within household misses, and in particular, what they can tell persons who believe they have been missed by a household that already returned a census form. Frank Vitrano (Chief, Decennial Management Division) explained that prior to NRFU, such persons can submit a Be Counted form, but that during NRFU, they would need to contact a Telephone Questionnaire Assistance Center to initiate the process that can get them added. Another question concerned the performance of the bilingual census forms. Director Groves said it is hard to tell because they do not have control areas (all areas that qualified received the bilingual form), but that what evidence they have does not suggest a big impact on response.

Committee on National Statistics Panels on Census and American Community Survey

Daniel Cork. National Academy of Sciences

Cork provided background on the National Academies, and an overview of recent and current CNSTAT projects related to the census. These include early appraisals of “next census” plans, assessments of alternative designs and methods, and assessments of censuses in progress.

Recent projects include a final report of a panel reviewing the Census Program of Evaluations and Experiments, and early work on the 2020 census. Key recommendations include the need for early R&D, and commitment to cost reduction without compromising quality. They call for comparisons of alternative “visions” for the 2020 census, and the need to integrate census research with field/operational planning and the ACS.

Cork noted that CNSTAT real time assessments of censuses in progress are rare, but recalled their work on 2000, where the focus was coverage measurement, and the decision on adjustment. CNSTAT has a panel to review the 2010 census, but Cork described it as a hybrid – an assessment of the 2010 census, but with a view to improvements for the 2020 census. The panel has 14 members, who are currently visiting local census offices, and observing census operations.

The American Community Survey is an emerging area of focus for CNSTAT, and Cork described a new panel on statistical methods for measuring group quarters population in

the ACS. CNSTAT also is looking more broadly at the future of federal household surveys.

Planning for the 2020 Census

Daniel Weinberg, Assistant Director for American Community Survey and Decennial Census. Census Bureau.

Weinberg listed the challenges faced by the 2010 census – rising costs, declining response rates, continued use of paper methods, and the need for address canvassing – and said the 2020 census will face even greater challenges. Research projects for 2020 are being prioritized based on their potential to reduce costs, improve quality, reduce the duration of field data collection, customize response modes, and leverage the ACS. Priority also is given to projects with the potential to support continual address frame updating, agile decision-making, the use of administrative data, leverage existing systems and methods, use external partners, and support solutions benefiting multiple programs.

The overall goal is to develop a design that can deliver the highest quality census, while reducing costs and managing risks. In pursuing this goal, the Census Bureau has solicited bold and innovative ideas from Census staff and key stakeholders, consolidated more than 600 ideas to approximately 75 possible research projects, assessed the potential of these projects relative to the planning principles described above, and developed cost estimates for 41 high and medium priority projects.

Weinberg said address frame updating is a big question. Will they have to conduct address canvassing in 2019, or will a continuous approach work well enough? It is widely expected that Internet response will be part of the 2020 census, but the question is how best to do this.

The 2020 census planning effort has settled on six design alternatives that differ on four basic dimensions.

- Address canvassing: full, targeted or none.
- Use of administrative records for NRFU: little, some or all.
- Self-response enumeration: USPS based, mixed mode, or all electronic.
- Field infrastructure: decentralized, hybrid, or central command.

For example, the “Enhancing the Baseline” alternative is most similar to the 2010 design in that it calls for full address canvassing, little use of administrative records, USPS based enumeration, and a decentralized field infrastructure. The “Extreme Automation” alternative is one of the more significant departures, as it calls for no address canvassing, some use of administrative records, all electronic enumeration, and a central command field infrastructure.

The presentation to the CAC was described as the launch of stakeholder outreach on 2020 census planning. Questions include how the public will react to the increased use of administrative records, and how widespread Internet access will be by 2020.

Erica Groshen (Federal Reserve Bank of New York) and Howard Silver (Consortium of Social Science Associations) presented as discussants. Groshen observed that the Census Bureau had presented not so much a plan for the next census, but a plan for how to get to a plan for the next census. She described the process as sensible given the complexity of the challenges facing the next census. Silver said the key is flexibility. He noted that the Census Bureau has been good at decision-making under uncertainty, and will need to be good at this in the lead up to 2020. Among the uncertainties are the possibility of a diminished USPS, the need to use administrative data for NRFU, and changes in the way we view race and ethnicity.

Arturo Vargas (NALEO) made a case for reaching out to technical experts, and for keeping the partnership program going through the decade, so they do not have to start from scratch for 2020. Weinberg said the Census Bureau is reaching out to technical experts, but expressed doubt that they can keep the partnership program going after 2010. Other comments stressed the importance of MAF updating and the limitations of administrative data. With respect to MAF updates, Weinberg noted that they plan to keep the Community Address Updating System going, and are already thinking about improvements to LUCA. He agreed that administrative data are limited – sometimes touting 98 percent coverage, even though that is not good enough for a census.

Rebecca Blank. Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce

CAC Chair Marc Morial welcomed Commerce Under Secretary Rebecca Blank, who remarked that we might wish the census mail participation rate were 10 points higher, but must realize that it could have been much worse. That we have a rate comparable to 2000 is a significant achievement given the circumstances.

Blank described her travels in support of the census, including a visit related to the Census sponsorship of a car in three NASCAR races. As Blank described it, those NASCAR people really know how to promote their sponsors. She also complimented Director Groves on his promotional efforts, and recommended that everyone check out his appearance on The Daily Show.

Looking to 2020, Blank asked that the CAC reps think outside the box, and push the Census Bureau toward “super stretch” goals. Asked about the plan to add additional reps to the CAC, Blank assured that the plan is still moving forward, but more slowly than initially expected.

Status of Selected 2010 Census Evaluations 2010 Census Ethnographic Studies

Observing Census Enumeration of Non-English-Speaking Households Yuling Pan. Statistical Research Division. Census Bureau

The objective of this study is to observe NRFU interviews to identify the challenges in interviewing non-English speaking households, how enumerators approach these

households, and the measures they take to collect required data. The observations will determine changes to improve non-English interviews and the 2020 language assistance program. The study has progressed through the design phase, research teams have been assembled, research sites have been chosen, and the observation protocol and debriefing questions have been developed. The research sites are areas with high concentrations of households that speak one of seven languages – Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian, Vietnamese, Arabic, and Portuguese. Next steps include the translation of the protocol and debriefing questions, NRFU interview observations (May 8 to May 29), an analysis workshop (August 2010) and final reporting (November 2010).

Ethnography Study of Group Quarters (GQ) in the 2010 Census.

Anna Chan. Statistical Research Division

The objectives of this study are to explore the optimal method for measuring various types of GQ populations, identify challenges and successes in enumerating GQ populations, and generate common themes and explanations from these observations. The study has hired six principal ethnographers and their teams, including subject matter experts with Special Sworn Status who make observations before, during and after GQ enumeration. About 25 GQ facilities are currently being observed nationwide, including correctional facilities, nursing homes, college housing, military quarters, homeless shelters, and group homes. Post enumeration interviews and/or focus groups will be conducted with GQ staff and residents as well as with census takers, and November 2010 is the tentative target for reporting results.

Comparative Ethnographic Studies of Enumeration Methods and Coverage

Laurie Schwede. U.S. Census Bureau

This study will observe census interviews to identify ways to improve the enumeration of race/ethnic subpopulations, and to explore census accuracy and completeness issues. The ultimate objective is to suggest improvements that can lead to reductions in differential miscounts. The method includes a set of small field studies with the observation of interviews in sites for 6 to 9 race-ethnic groups. The project is currently recruiting and selecting researchers to conduct observations in race/ethnic focused sites.

Arturo Vargas (NALEO) noted the moves to have prison populations counted at pre-incarceration residences, and Ilene Jacobs (California Rural Legal Assistance) noted that the Subcommittee on Hard to Locate Housing had recommended ethnographic work on the challenges associated with hard to locate housing. Schwede responded that she is asking her researchers to keep an eye out for such units, but there seem to be no ethnographic studies in the works devoted to hard to locate housing.

Alternative Questionnaire Experiment

Nicholas Jones and Sonya Rastogi. U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division

Jones reviewed the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE) design – which tests alternative versions of the race and Hispanic origin questions by providing panels of 2010 census respondents with alternative versions of these questions. The objective is to identify strategies for improving the accuracy, completeness, and reliability of future data

on race and Hispanic origin. The AQE has a three part design strategy, including mailout survey, re-interview, and focus groups. In the mailout phase, 15 panels (30,000 housing units per panel) receive experimental forms, while two control panels receive the standard questions. The telephone re-interview will be conducted with a sample of the AQE mail respondents, and focus groups will supplement the quantitative research. The results should provide a better understanding of self-identification of race and Hispanic origin, and identify issues that respondents have with the alternative questions. The mailout phase coincides with 2010 census mailback, the re-interview is scheduled for summer 2010, and the focus groups are scheduled for winter/spring 2011.

Ed Spar (COPAFS) asked if they are looking at the Internet response option as a way to better explain the race and origin questions to respondents in future censuses. Jones said it is a great question, and confirmed that it is something they are considering.

Coverage Measurement

Magdalena Ramos, Patrick Cantwell. U.S. Census Bureau
Discussant: Kimball Brace, Election Data Services, Inc.

Ramos explained that the goal of the 2010 census coverage measurement (CCM) program is to provide information that can contribute to improvements for the 2020 census – there is no intent to adjust the 2010 counts.

The CCM design is a post-enumeration survey based on an independent listing of one million addresses conducted from August - December 2009. Computer matching of the CCM addresses to the census MAF was conducted January – February, 2010, and initial housing unit matching and follow up runs February - May, 2010. The remaining activities include person interviews (August - October, 2010), person matching (December 2010 – April, 2011), person follow up (January – March, 2011), and final housing unit match and follow up (March – June, 2011). There are also initiatives to reduce non-sampling error – such as higher field re-interview rates, higher matching review rates, enhanced training, and smaller employee-to-supervisor ratios. Ramos also described a recall bias test – exploring the extent to which people forget to tell interviewers (at different times during the census cycle) that they moved around Census Day

With the day's time running short, Cantwell briefly described the proposed level of release for the dual system estimates of percent net undercount. Percent net undercount would be released for the nation, all states, counties and places with populations of 100,000 or more, and state balances. The proposal is to release components of coverage (erroneous and correct enumerations and omissions) for total U.S., all states, counties and places with 2010 populations of 500,000 or more, and state balances.

Discussant Kim Brace (Election Data Services) noted that the 2000 measures focused on net coverage, and expressed appreciation for the greater attention to components in 2010. But he wondered if there might be confusion over the 100,000 and 500,000 thresholds, which will result in “balance of state” being different for the net and component

measures. He also asked about coverage measures by race, but Cantwell indicated that such measures are not planned.

2010 Census Data Tabulation

Indigenous Population and Some Other Race

Nicholas Jones, Roberto Ramirez. Population Division, Census Bureau

Jones and Ramirez described the race and Hispanic origin data that will be provided in selected data products (such as Demographic Profiles and SF1). Much of the discussion concerned the reporting of detailed categories beyond those of the OMB standards. For example, Central and South American Indian groups are defined by the OMB standards as “American Indian and Alaska Native,” but will be reported for expanded categories including Aztec, Mayan, Zapotec, etc. Jones and Ramirez also described the unique codes maintained for groups such as Brazilian and Portuguese, which OMB classifies as not-Hispanic. Data for these groups are not published in standard products, but can be requested in special tabulations. The same is true for race data, where, for example, one will be able to request special tabulations for categories such as Arab American. Of course, such tabulations will not be complete counts, as they will reflect only persons who wrote in detailed identifiers. And as with all special tabulations, they must be approved by the Disclosure Review Board, and there is a fee for their production.

Same Sex Couples

Martin O’Connell. Census Bureau Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division, Census Bureau

O’Connell gave a brief presentation on the tables for reporting census data on same sex couples, and explained why it is not as easy as one might think. For example, there are many “socially defined marriages” among same sex couples – many more than the number of legally recognized same sex marriages. And there is the phenomenon of legal marriages that are not really same sex, but are reported as such because one person’s sex was reported incorrectly. O’Connell showed examples of the tables that will be reported for 2010, and explained that the tables were developed in consultation with Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender groups. He also noted that OMB has established an interagency working group on the measurement of relationships in federal surveys, and that the Census Bureau is conducting cognitive tests and focus groups on the topic.

Day Two

Nancy Gordon started the meeting, and turned it over to CAC Vice Chair Pauline Medrano.

Congressional Update.

Angela Manso, Congressional Affairs Office, Census Bureau .

Manso summarized the census-related congressional hearings held since Bob Groves became Director, noting that the House hearings have focused on the ability to count hard-to-count populations. The next hearing is April 30 – on NRFU, and the ability to

count the hard-to-count. Manso reported that next year's budget includes funding focused on the ACS, the use of administrative records, and work on a supplementary poverty measure. There was no Q&A of note.

REAC Update.

Leigh Ann McGee. Chair, Census Advisory Committee on the American Indian and Alaska Native Populations

McGee spent much of her time describing the REACs, and the more regional and local perspective they have in promoting a complete and accurate count of the populations they represent. She described the REAC's final review of the paid median campaign in December, and their attendance at road tour and partnership events.

With respect to Census 2010, the REACs are concerned that some populations of interest have been missed by the paid media campaign, and they have concerns about the funding levels for the partnership program. McGee also noted REAC support for the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment, and their interest in a comprehensive review of the results.

Arturo Vargas (NALEO) asked about the composition of the REACs, and if they are fully staffed. Census Director Groves explained that he wants to get through the 2010 cycle, and then consider what form makes the most sense for all the advisory committees in advance of the 2020 census. He is concerned that we not add new members in advance of this transition, but acknowledged that the Census Bureau has been impolite in not getting back to organizations that have expressed interest in serving.

Redistricting Program Developments

Catherine McCully, Census Redistricting Data Office

McCully noted that the 2010 redistricting data will be out by this time next year. In late February, the Census Bureau sent out voting district verification notices, and only Rhode Island did not participate in the program that invites states to submit corrections (by March 31). The Bureau is now incorporating the corrections into its files.

In preparation for data release, the Census Bureau has notified states that the TIGER/Line files will start coming out in December, and is finalizing the addresses to which they are to be sent. As soon as the shape files are delivered and received, they will be released on the Census website—providing users with their first look at the 2010 census tabulation geographies. The geographic files are needed so states can start using the redistricting data as soon as they are released. The flow of redistricting data will begin in early February and be completed by the April 1 deadline. Efforts are made to confirm that the data are received by states in a bipartisan manner, and with this verification, the data will be made available to the public.

In response to a question, McCully confirmed that the files indicating the correspondence between 2010 and 2000 census geography will be a subsequent and separate product from the geographic files released in December. The shape files will include school districts (school year 2009-2010) and legislative districts relevant to 2008 elections. The

data files will have standard block level content (population, race, Hispanic origin, housing units) plus separate totals for occupied and vacant housing.

There will also be an advance release of the 2010 counts of group quarters population (by type of facility), which some states will use to exclude prison populations from redistricting. McCully stressed that this is strictly a state decision, and that seven states have passed plans to do this. In addition, the early release will help local areas assess the quality of their GQ counts, and if necessary, get an early start on challenges to them. The early GQ release is planned for sometime in May 2011.

American Community Survey Programs

Jim Hartman. Decennial Statistical Studies Division, Census Bureau

Anthony Tersine. Decennial Statistical Studies Division, Census Bureau

Hartman explained that the Census Bureau's Master Address File (MAF) provides the sampling frame for the American Community Survey. In areas with city style addresses, the MAF is updated with new releases of the US Postal Service Delivery Sequence File (DSF), but the DSF falls well short of a complete update, especially in rural areas. The Community Address Updating System (CAUS) is a program to improve MAF coverage in such areas based on information gathered by census field staff. CAUS is still in a test mode with 2010 and 2011 activities focused on the evaluation of algorithms and sources for identifying blocks most in need of CAUS updates.

Tersine described a proposal to apply data reliability indicators to ACS estimates – stressing that this is just a suggestion, and not yet a plan. The concern is that novice data users might not understand the margins of error (MOEs) already reported with ACS data, and therefore need a more blunt indication of reliability based on sampling error. Several variations were presented, but all classify the “reliability” of ACS estimates based on the coefficient of variation (CV). For example, in addition to reporting estimates and MOEs for a 10 cell table, a separate “Reliability” field might classify the estimate for each cell as “Reliable,” “Somewhat Reliable,” or “Not Very Reliable” – perhaps also color coding these designations as green, yellow, or red.

Issues with reliability indicators include the CV cutoffs for the classifications, problems with the CV measure for small estimates, and the inability to account for non-sampling error. There is also concern that such indicators might dissuade users from using “Not Very Reliable” estimates in an appropriate way – such as by aggregating to larger areas. Usability tests are being conducted to explore users' reactions to the reliability indicators, and the extent to which they impact -decisions to use an estimate.

Session discussant Ed Spar (COPAFS) praised the thoroughness of the proposal, and acknowledged the need to caution novice users. But he reinforced the Census Bureau's concerns, and cautioned that tables full of bright red “Not Very Reliable” cells might cause appropriators to question what they are paying for. An extended discussion followed, with some reps expressing concern that the indicators would give a negative impression of the data for the small populations they represent. Your APDU rep expressed concern that novice users would misunderstand the classifications –

interpreting “Not Very Reliable” as “Definitely Not Accurate” rather than the indication of uncertainty that it is. He is also concerned that, in contrast to MOEs, which are a presentation of facts, the reliability indicators are a presentation of opinion.

**CAC Working Group on Hard to Locate Housing Report to Full Committee
Ilene Jacobs, Chair of the 2010 CAC Working Group on Hard to Locate Housing**

Jacobs started by taking issue with the CAUS focus on areas with non-city style addresses – noting that many hard to locate units are in areas with city style addresses. Jim Hartman explained that CAUS focuses on non-city address areas because they have DSF updates for city address areas, but he noted that they are reviewing the address canvassing results to identify city style address areas where canvassing found additional addresses. Dan Weinberg (Assistant Director for American Community Survey and Decennial Census) added that the focus on non-city style address areas also reflects the allocation of scarce resources.

Jacobs expressed appreciation for the meeting and conference calls the working group had with Census staff, but noted that the working group’s recommendations were either rejected or not responded to. The time has past for implementing these recommendations for 2010, but Jacobs said the working group will continue to press for research in the area, which is especially important because cost reduction measures are likely to increase the risk that hard to locate units will be missed. With these concerns in mind, the working group recommends additional meetings with Census staff.

Director Groves thanked the working group, and pointed to the ACS as a vehicle for testing in advance of 2020. But he acknowledged that this is a really tough area that involves both operational challenges and definitional issues.

Public Comment

Gloria Green, with the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, spoke briefly on the growing population of Latinos in Rhode Island, and expressed concern that money for targeted media buys is not making it to this emerging market.

William Kellibrew, speaking on behalf of the National Coalition on Black Civic Participation, raised concern that people in some hard-to-count areas are not receiving census forms, that some Questionnaire Assistance Centers are providing incorrect or confusing information, and that some Be Counted locations do not have enough forms.

Committee Assessment of Meeting Content/Recommendations

CAC Chair Marc Morial asked the reps for recommendations from this meeting. Suggestions for recommendations included the following.

- A presentation on Demographic Analysis at the next meeting.
- Release of 2010 gross errors by race and origin at state and sub-state levels.
- A meeting on hard to locate housing prior to the October CAC meeting.
- Possible lifting of Title 13 restrictions on address information.

- Investigation and report on the 2010 enumeration on the Texas/Mexico border.
- A user friendly guide to ACS data (more basic than the Compass documents).
- Clarification on the suspension of ICE raids during the census process.
- Details on how the additional \$22 million for communications is being spent.
- Credentials in Braille for NRFU enumerators.

Morial suggested the need to bifurcate recommendations between those for 2010, and those related to the future. The Chair expressed particular interest in emergency steps that could boost participation in low mail response areas – steps such as proactively informing communities that they are lagging, thus moving them to get out the count. Morial also recommended that the Census Bureau tighten and modify the paid messaging – including TV ads. He rejected the notion that it was too late to produce new TV ads, noting that political campaigns regularly create and run new ads on tight timelines. The new ads, he suggested, could educate non-respondents about NRFU visits, explaining that the process is safe, and that it is important to participate. He called on the CAC to sharpen its recommendations, and to push the Census Bureau at this critical time.

Stressing the tight timeline, Director Groves commented that any changes for 2010 would have to be made in the next few hours, and would require a subgroup of CAC reps to stay and keep working after the meeting’s formal conclusion. Groves also cautioned that for every good idea, there are unintended consequences.

Morial called for a sharpening of the CAC’s recommendations in the remaining minutes, and the recommendations narrowed on the following.

- Forcible communications to areas with lagging mail response.
- Better communications about what to do if you don’t receive a census form.
- Sharper messages about the response deadline, and preparation for NRFU.
- A task force to monitor the count in Texas/Mexico border areas.

Chair Morial asked the Census Bureau to communicate via email about the steps they will take on these CAC recommendations. Director Groves suggested that the Census Bureau could provide CAC reps with the talking points on these issues, and Jeri Green (Chief, Census Advisory Committee Office) agreed to send these via e-mail. Steve Jost (Associate Director for Communications) recommended that reps also check the “Whole Story” section of the Census website for useful talking points.

At this point, time had expired, and the meeting was adjourned.